

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/780,082	O'BANION ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Katherine W. Mitchell	3677	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Katherine W. Mitchell. (3)_____.

(2) Jeff Urian. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 4/19&20/2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 85,91 and 104.

Identification of prior art discussed: Jack '806.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Re claim 85- Examiner agreed Jack does not teach flanges which are physically separated and discrete, but examiner noted there could be a secondary teaching. Mr. Urian pointed out to examiner that discrete flanges would not work with Jack and thus there is no motivation to combine, and examiner agreed with his argument.

Re claim 91: Markush not required - record needs to be clear: and; or; and/or.

Re claim 104: Method claim - Mr. Urian noted definition of "contact" and description in specification. Examiner believed Jack taught contact, but not direct contact, and that it could be further driven to have direct contact. Mr. Urian argued that Flg 4 teaches final position (col. 5) which does not teach the method with flange contact. Examiner agreed to reconsider and call back. Examiner reconsidered and called back - if applicant explains on the record that driving until the flange segments are in direct contact with one of the framing members, not relying on contact via an intermediary member, the claim would not need amendment.

Re IDS: Examiner noted the exceptional and professional job in submitting the entire application, as well as Mr. Urian's professional, clear, and on-point presentations. Therefore, since the missing IDS references are clearly due to a typing error, examiner will list on examiner's 892 if the numbers are provided in the text of the response - no additional IDS or IDS fee will be needed.